



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/022,443	12/20/2001	Randal L. Dunn	95-474	5112
23164	7590	11/17/2005		EXAMINER
LEON R TURKEVICH				HAILE, FEBEN
2000 M STREET NW				
7TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 200363307				2663

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/022,443	DUNN ET AL.	
	Examiner Feben M. Haile	Art Unit 2663	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1, 6-11, 16-21, 26-31, and 36-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 2-5, 12-15, 22-25 and 32-35 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 December 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION***Drawings***

1. The drawings are objected to because Figures 1-4 are hand written. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 1, 6-11, 16-21, 26-31, and 36-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeda (Us 6,876,632), hereinafter referred to as Abe in view of Jeong (US 5,912,628), herein after referred to as Jeong.

Regarding claims 1, 11, 21, and 31, Takeda discloses a routing table configured for storing message class entries identifying respective message classes (**figure 3A unit 401 and column 7 lines 1-5; a SCP Address Management Table defines a type of message received**), each message class entry specifying at least one destination link identifier for a corresponding destination link assigned to the corresponding message class (**figure 3A unit 403 and column 7 lines 1-5; the SCP Address Management Table defines a destination of a received message in corresponded with the type of message**).

Takeda fails to teach a processor configured for selecting one of the destination links based on classifying the received signaling message as assigned to the corresponding message class, based on prescribed message class selection criteria.

Jeong discloses a method for selecting a link for the transmission of signal messages classified according to a specific criterion (**column 3 lines 12-17**).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Takeda to incorporate the teachings of Jeong. The motivation being an improved circuit and method of selecting a signal link in an exchange system.

Regarding claims 6, 16, 26, and 36, Jeong discloses wherein the processor is configured for classifying the received signaling message based on prescribed user-

selected selection criteria (**column 3 lines 12-17; a criterion classifies the signal message into two types**).

Regarding claims 7, 17, 27, and 37, Jeong discloses wherein the user-selected selection criteria includes a user-selected data pattern (**column 3 lines 12-17; the criterion is obtained by dividing the SLS value contained in the signal message by two, wherein the SLS value is the decimal equivalent of the binary code for the signal message**).

Regarding claims 8, 18, 28, and 38, Jeong discloses wherein the processor is configured for classifying the received signaling message based on a service indicator value from the received signaling message (**column 3 lines 12-17; a SLS value contained in the signal message is used for classifying the signal message into two types**).

3. Claims 9-10, 19-20, 29-30, and 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeda (US 6,876,632), hereinafter referred to as Takeda in view of Jeong (US 5,912,628), herein after referred to as Jeong, as applied to claims 1, 6-11, 16-21, 26-31, and 36-40 above, and further in view of Lee (US 2001/0008532), hereinafter referred to as Lee.

Regarding claims 9, 19, 29, and 39, Abe in combination with Jeong disclose the limitations of base claims 1, 11, 21, and 31.

Takeda, Jeong, or their combination fail to teach wherein the processor is configured for classifying the received signaling message based on global title translation (GTT) parameters retrieved from the received signaling message.

Lee discloses a No. 7 gateway that provides global title translation services represented by unique numbers (**page 1 paragraph 0006**) where these services are classified according to these values (**page 1 paragraph 0007**).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Takeda and Jeong to incorporate the teachings of Lee. The motivation being mapping a translation type in a number 7 gateway signaling network, which can perform a mapping function for different translation types.

Regarding claims 10, 20, 30, and 40, Lee discloses wherein the processor classifies the received message based on a Global Title Address (GTA) from the GTT parameters (**page 1 paragraph 0006-0007;** global title translation services are represented by unique numbers that are used for classification; it would have been obvious that the GTA could have been one of those numbers).

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 2-5, 12-15, 22-25, and 32-35 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

a) Tinsley et al. (US 20020131400), Distributed Signaling System 7 (SS7)

Message Routing Gateway

b) Gradischnig (US 20040137904), Method and Device for Routing

Messages in SS7 Networks

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Feben M. Haile whose telephone number is (571) 272-3072. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00am - 3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Ngo can be reached on (571) 272-3139. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

[Signature] 11/14/2008

Ricky Ngo
RICKY NGO
PRIMARY EXAMINER